



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,443	04/17/2001	Yoshinobu Shiraiwa	35.C15299	5474

5514 7590 06/13/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

COLILLA, DANIEL JAMES

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/835,443

Applicant(s)

SHIRAIWA, YOSHINOBU

Examiner

Daniel J. Colilla

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8-11 and 14-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8-11 and 14-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102


- The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- Claims 1-2, 4 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chaikel et al. (US 6,726,252).

With respect to claim 1, Chaikel et al. discloses a printing paper including a center portion 16 having a rectangular form and a pair of outside portions 36,38 as shown below in the Figure taken from Figure 4 of Chaikel et al.:



The paper includes two pairs of opposite sides; the outside portions 36,38 are connected to one pair of opposite sides and the other remaining pair of opposite sides is not connected to any other paper. The outside portions 36,38 are edge portions because they are located along the edges of

Art Unit: 2854

the center portion. Figure 4 of Chaikel et al. shows that the center portion 16 has a curved edge smoothly connecting adjacent sides of the center portion 16 at its four corners and that the outside portions 36,38 are connected to the center portion via a straight line portion as shown above (note that the claim does not require *only* a straight line portion). The above Figure also shows that the outside portions 36,38 are only connected to one center portion 16.

With respect to claim 2, Chaikel et al. discloses tear lines 32 between the center portion 16 and the outer portions 36,38 in col. 6, lines 60-63. In col. 5, lines 24-25, Chaikel et al. discloses that tear lines 32 are perforated.

With respect to claim 4, Chaikel et al. shows in Figure 4 that each curved shape of the corners is an arc form.

With respect to claim 17, Chaikel et al. discloses a printing paper that is capable of not being printed on the outside portions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5-6, 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaikel et al. (US 6,726,252) in view of Popat (US 5,997,683).

With respect to claim 5, Chaikel et al. discloses a printing paper disclosed as mentioned above with respect to claims 1-2, 4 and 17. Chaikel et al. further discloses that the printing paper

Art Unit: 2854

may be a label paper (Chaikel et al., col. 5, lines 1-5). However, Chaikel et al. does not disclose a receiving layer releasably laminated on a supporting layer. Popat teaches a label printing paper with a receiving layer 46 laminated on a supporting layer as shown in Figures 4-5 of Popat (col. 4, lines 17-20). It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Popat with the printing paper disclosed by Chaikel et al. for the advantage of creating a self adhesive label that does not require any other structure or device to be applied to an object.

With respect to claim 2, Chaikel et al. discloses tear lines 32 between the center portion 16 and the outer portions 36,38 in col. 6, lines 60-63. In col. 5, lines 24-25, Chaikel et al. discloses that tear lines 32 are perforated.

With respect to claim 8, Chaikel et al. shows in Figure 4 that each curved shape of the corners is an arc form.


With respect to claim 18, Chaikel et al. discloses a printing paper that is capable of not being printed on the outside portions.

5. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onishi (US 6,652,171) in view of either of Doerr et al. (US 5,658,648) or Osborne (US 5,379,538).

With respect to claims 1 and 5, Onishi discloses the claimed printing paper (or label printing paper) except for the four corners having a round shape. Onishi discloses a printing paper as shown in Figures 14-15 of Onishi. In col. 8, lines 52-67, Onishi discloses that the printing paper 1 which has a top surface as a printing layer may have a release sheet that is a supporting layer. A center portion having a rectangular form and two pairs of opposite sides

Art Unit: 2854

connected by four corners and outside portions are shown below in the Figure taken from Figure 14 of Onishi:



The outside portions are edge portions of the printing paper and the other pair of opposite sides are not connected to any other paper. Either of Osborne or Doerr et al. teach labels with curved portions connecting adjacent sides at each corner as shown in Figures 7 and 1 respectively.

It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Osborne with the printing paper (or label printing paper) disclosed by Onishi to create a center portion with rounded corners for the advantage of a label that does not easily snag and a label that is more aesthetically appealing (Osborne col. 7, lines 24-28 and lines 33-40).

It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Doerr et al. with the printing paper (or label printing paper) disclosed by Onishi to create a center portion with rounded corners for the advantage of a label less likely to curl (Doerr et al., col. 9, lines 50-55).

With respect to claims 2 and 6, Onishi discloses easy separating means 2 which can be perforations between the center portion and the outside portion (col. 5, lines 47-51).

Art Unit: 2854

With respect to claims 4 and 8, the curved edges disclosed by either of Osborne or Doerr et al. are arc forms.

With respect to claims 15-16, Onishi in view of either of Osborne or Doerr et al. discloses the claimed printing paper (or label printing paper) except for the exact size of the center portion. However, Onishi discloses that the printing medium 1 may be any size including a name card size (Onishi, col. 9, lines 34-36). It is noted here that the standard name card size is approximately 55 mm X 90 mm (US 6,774,980 to Hoshino col. 8, lines 19-20, US 6,383,452 to Miyake et al., col. 5, lines 38-40 and US 6,369,332 to Saitoh et al. col. 27, lines 26-28 may be referenced to determine standard name card size). While the dimensions disclosed by Onishi are not exactly the same as those disclosed in claim 15 and 16, the claimed size of printing paper (or label printing paper) would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since a slight change of size of the prior art is not a basis for patentability (see MPEP 2143.01, part IV, section A).

With respect to claims 17-18, Onishi discloses a printing paper (or label printing paper) capable of not being printed on the outside portions.

6. Claims 9-11, 14 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onishi (US 6,652,171) in view of either of Doerr et al. (US 5,658,648) or Osborne (US 5,379,538) as applied to claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 15, 16, 17 and 18 above, and further in view of Nakanishi (US 6,153,557).

With respect to claims 9-10, Onishi in view of either of Doerr et al. or Osborne disclose the claimed printing process including the step of providing the claimed printing paper (or label

Art Unit: 2854

printing paper) of claims 1 and 5 respectively except that it is not known if the printer disclosed by Onishi is arranged to print while holding the outside portions of the printing paper (or label printing paper). However, Nakanishi teaches a printer that prints on a center portion of a printing paper (or label printing paper) 30 shown in Figure 2 of Nakanishi with a printer shown in Figure 3 of Nakanishi. In col. 6, lines 35-60, Nakanishi details how the conveyor roller pair 53 holds the printing paper (or label printing paper) 30 as it sequentially prints three colors on the paper. The roller pair 53 moves the sheet back and forth to print these colors on a center portion of the paper 30. It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Nakanishi with the printing process disclosed by Onishi in view of either of Doerr et al. or Osborne for the advantage of drying the ink between the printing steps of printing each color (Nakanishi, col. 5, lines 27-37) therefore preventing smearing of previously printed colors while a new color is being printed.

With respect to claims 11 and 14, Onishi in view of either of Doerr et al. or Osborne disclose the claimed printing system except that it is not known if the printer disclosed by Onishi has a pair of conveyor rollers. However, Nakanishi teaches a print head 57 and a pair of conveyor rollers 53, as shown in Figure 3 of Nakanishi, which hold the outside portions of the printing paper (or label printing paper) to convey the paper. It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Nakanishi with the printing process disclosed by Onishi in view of either of Doerr et al. or Osborne for the advantage of drying the ink between the printing steps of printing each color (Nakanishi, col. 5, lines 27-37) therefore preventing smearing of previously printed colors while a new color is being printed.


Art Unit: 2854

With respect to claims 21-24, Onishi in view of either of Doerr et al. or Osborne and Nakanishi discloses the claimed process. The pair of conveyer rollers disclosed by Nakanishi hold the paper until the printing is completed as mentioned above and in col. 5, lines 27-37 of Nakanishi. The printer disclosed by Nakanishi can print over the entire center portion that is intended to be printed regardless of how the printing paper is conveyed.

7. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art in view of either of Doerr et al. (US 5,658,648) or Osborne (US 5,379,538).

With respect to claims 1 and 5, in applicant's admission of prior art applicant describes the claimed printing paper (or label printing paper) except for the four corners having a round shape. On page 4, line 6 through page 6, line 15, and in Figures 13-14 applicant has shown below in the Figure taken from Figure 13 of applicant's disclosure, that the prior art teaches a printing paper or label printing paper with a center portion having a rectangular form, having two pairs of opposite sides connected by four corners and a pair of outside portions connected to the center portion at one pair of the two pairs of opposite sides of the center portion:

FIG. 13
PRIOR ART



The outside portions are edge portions of the printing paper and the other pair of opposite sides are not connected to any other paper. Either of Osborne or Doerr et al. teach labels with curved portions connecting adjacent sides at each corner as shown in Figures 7 and 1 respectively.

It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Osborne with the printing paper (or label printing paper) disclosed in applicant's admission of prior art to create a center portion with rounded corners for the advantage of a label that does not easily snag and a label that is more aesthetically appealing (Osborne col. 7, lines 24-28 and lines 33-40).

It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Doerr et al. with the printing paper (or label printing paper) disclosed in applicant's admission of prior art to create a center portion with rounded corners for the advantage of a label less likely to curl (Doerr et al., col. 9, lines 50-55).

With respect to claims 2 and 6, applicant discloses in his admission of prior art easy perforations between the center portion and the outside portion as shown in applicant's Figure

With respect to claims 4 and 8, the round shapes disclosed by either of Osborne or Doerr et al. are arc forms.

Art Unit: 2854

With respect to claims 17-18, Onishi discloses a printing paper (or label printing paper) capable of not being printed on the outside portions.

8. Claims 9-11, 14 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admission of prior art in view of either of Doerr et al. (US 5,658,648) or Osborne (US 5,379,538) as applied to claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 17 and 18 above, and further in view of Nakanishi (US 6,153,557).

With respect to claims 9-10, applicant's admission of prior art in view of either of Doerr et al. or Osborne disclose the claimed printing process including the step of providing the claimed printing paper (or label printing paper) of claims 1 and 5 respectively except that it is not known if the printer used for printing the paper is arranged to print while holding the outside portions of the printing paper (or label printing paper). However, Nakanishi teaches a printer that prints on a center portion of a printing paper (or label printing paper) 30 shown in Figure 2 of Nakanishi with a printer shown in Figure 3 of Nakanishi. In col. 6, lines 35-60, Nakanishi details how the conveyor roller pair 53 holds the printing paper (or label printing paper) 30 as it sequentially prints three colors on the paper. The roller pair 53 moves the sheet back and forth to print these colors on a center portion of the paper 30. It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Nakanishi with the printing process disclosed by applicant's admission of prior art in view of either of Doerr et al. or Osborne for the advantage of drying the ink between the printing steps of printing each color (Nakanishi, col. 5, lines 27-37) therefore preventing smearing of previously printed colors while a new color is being printed.

With respect to claims 11 and 14, applicant's admission of prior art in view of either of

Doerr et al. or Osborne disclose the claimed printing system except that it is not known if the printer used to print the paper has a pair of conveyor rollers. However, Nakanishi teaches a print head 57 and a pair of conveyer rollers 53, as shown in Figure 3 of Nakanishi, which hold the outside portions of the printing paper (or label printing paper) to convey the paper. It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Nakanishi with the printing process disclosed by applicant's admission of prior art in view of either of Doerr et al. or Osborne for the advantage of drying the ink between the printing steps of printing each color (Nakanishi, col. 5, lines 27-37) therefore preventing smearing of previously printed colors while a new color is being printed.

With respect to claims 21-24, applicant's admission of prior art in view of either of Doerr et al. or Osborne and Nakanishi disclose the claimed process. The pair of conveyer rollers disclosed by Nakanishi hold the paper until the printing is completed as mentioned above and in col. 5, lines 27-37 of Nakanishi. The printer disclosed by Nakanishi can print over the entire center portion that is intended to be printed regardless of how the printing paper is conveyed.

9. Claims 1-2, 4, 15, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLeod in view of Nakaya.

With respect to claim 1, McLeod discloses the claimed printing paper except for the round shape of the four corners. McLeod discloses a printing paper with a center portion 10a and two end portions 10b and 10c. The center portion has two pairs of opposite sides and four corners as shown in Figures 1, 5 and 6 of McLeod. Additionally, one pair of opposite sides of the central portion 10a have no other printing paper attached. Nakaya teaches a printed sheet 2

Art Unit: 2854

(therefore a printing paper) with a central portion 1. The center portion has curved edges at each of its corners smoothly connecting adjacent sides of the center portion as shown in Figure 1 of Nakaya. It is noted that the right side of the central portion 1 is not attached to any other printing paper, thus it is known to create rounded corners at an edge of a printing paper. The selection of rounded corners over squared corners would have been an obvious variation to one of ordinary skill in the art which would be selected for the aesthetic design of the paper and for the reduction of catching when the printed item is inserted into holders such as pocketed folders, wallets or shirt pockets.

With respect to claim 2, McLeod discloses that the printing paper has perforations 12 and 14 between the center portion 10a and the outside portions 10b and 10c.

With respect to claim 4, the round corners taught by Nakaya are shaped as arcs as shown in Figure 1 of Nakaya.

With respect to claim 15, any size of printing paper would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since the size of the paper has no bearing on the above mentioned structure.

With respect to claim 17, McLeod discloses a printing paper where an image is not formed on the outside portions.

With respect to claim 19, to the extent that this claim can be understood, McLeod discloses perforations in a straight line.

10. Claims 5-6, 8, 16, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLeod in view of Skees and Nakamura.

Art Unit: 2854

With respect to claim 5 McLeod discloses the claimed printing paper except for the round shape of the four corners and that the paper is a label. McLeod discloses a printing paper with a center portion 10a and two end portions 10b and 10c. The center portion has two pairs of opposite sides and four corners as shown in Figure 1, 5 and 6 of McLeod. Additionally, one pair of opposite sides of the center portion 10a have no other printing paper attached. Skees teaches a printed sheet 26 (therefore a printing paper) with an inner portion 36. The inner portion is curved at the four corners of inner portion 36 smoothly connecting adjacent sides of the inner portion 36 as shown in Figure 7 of Skees. It is noted that the bottom side of the inner portion 36 is not attached to any other label printing paper. Thus it is known to create rounded corners at an edge of a label printing paper. The selection of rounded corners of Skees over squared corners disclosed by McLeod would have been an obvious variation to one of ordinary skill in the art which would be selected for the aesthetic design of the paper and for the reduction of flagging (peeling off) of the corners.

Nakamura teaches a card 74 that is a central portion of a larger sheet 72 as shown in Figure 6 of Nakamura. Card 74 can be separated from a sheet 72 and applied as a label through the use of adhesive 76. It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Nakamura with the printing paper disclosed by McLeod for the advantage of permanently fixing the printed card to another surface for decorative purposes or to another sheet of paper for informational purposes.

With respect to claim 6, McLeod discloses that the printing paper has perforations 12 and 14 between the center portion 10a and the outside portions 10b and 10c.

Art Unit: 2854

With respect to claim 8, the rounded corners taught by Skees are shaped as an arc as shown in Figure 7 of Skees.

With respect to claim 16, any size or printing paper would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since the size of the paper has no bearing on the above mentioned structure.

With respect to claim 18, McLeod discloses a printing paper where an image is not formed on the outside portions.

With respect to claim 20, to the extent that this claim can be understood, McLeod discloses perforations in a straight line.

11. Claims 9-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLeod in view of Skees and Nakamura, as applied to claims 5-6, 8, 16, 18 and 20 above, and further in view of Hirano et al.

With respect to claims 9 and 10, McLeod in view of Skees and Nakamura discloses a printing paper as mentioned above, but it is not known to the examiner what type of feeding device is used in the printer 4. However, Hirano et al. teaches that it is known to feed a label paper through a printer while holding the outside edges of a label media as shown in Figure 3 of Hirano et al. It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Hirano et al. with the label printing paper disclosed by McLeod in view of Skees and Nakamura for the advantage of feeding the label media in both direction in order to maintain the correct tension in the media (see abstract of Hirano et al.). Additionally, it would have been obvious to print on label paper for the self-adhesive advantages of labels.

Art Unit: 2854

With respect to claims 11 and 14, Hirano et al. discloses a printing system including a printhead 24 and two rollers 17 and 18 which hold the entire label including the outside portions as shown in Figures 1 and 3 of Hirano et al.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 3/23/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive of any error in the above rejection.

With respect to applicant's amendment to claims 1 and 5, Chaikel et al. discloses both a straight line portion and a curved line portion for that are located between the curved edges for attaching the outside portions to the center portion. The phrase, "are removed from the center portion at the straight line portion" is a statement of intended use and has no bearing on the patentability of the positively recited structure in the claim.

With respect to applicant's arguments that the portions 16,36,38 of the printing paper shown in Figure 4 of Chaikel et al. is not printing paper, the examiner believes that it is appropriate to refer to separated portions of a larger piece of printing paper as "printing paper." It is still paper and it has been printed on. Regardless, applicant has not recited any structure in the body of the claim that tie the term "printing paper" (only found in the preamble) to the body of the claim.

13. With respect to applicant's arguments, regarding the combination of Onishi in view of Doerr et al. and Osborne, that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or

Art Unit: 2854

motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the examiner has relied upon the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Additionally, applicant states that “a sheet having curved edges, then some of the perforations in the modified sheet of Onishi would necessarily be curved because those perforations completely surround the center portion,” it is noted that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Similar arguments apply to the rejections made based on applicant’s admission of prior art.

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2854


CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Colilla whose telephone number is 571-272-2157. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on 571-272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 2, 2005


Daniel J. Colilla
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2854